

Summary of Cumulative Impacts

Chapter 4

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS UNDER CEQA

Section 15355 Cumulative Impacts

“Cumulative impacts” refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

- (a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.
- (b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.”¹

Section 15130 Discussion of Cumulative Impacts

“An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in section 15065 (a)(3). Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not “cumulatively considerable,” a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.

- (1) As defined in Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the EIR.
- (2) When the combined cumulative impact associated with the project’s incremental effect and the effects of other projects is not significant, the EIR shall briefly indicate why the cumulative impact is not significant and is not discussed in further detail in the EIR. A lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting the lead agency’s conclusion that the cumulative impact is less than significant.
- (3) An EIR may determine that a project’s contribution to a significant cumulative impact will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus is not significant. A project’s contribution is less than cumulatively considerable if the project is required to implement or fund its fair share of a mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact. The lead agency shall identify facts and analysis supporting its conclusion that the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively considerable.”²

¹ 2012 CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355

² Ibid., Section 15130 (a)

“The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact. The following elements are necessary to an adequate discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

- (1) Either:
 - (A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or
 - (B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Such plans may include: a general plan, regional transportation plan, or plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A summary of projections may also be contained in an adopted or certified prior environmental document for such a plan. Such projections may be supplemented with additional information such as a regional modeling program. Any such document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.
- (2) When utilizing a list, as suggested in paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), factors to consider when determining whether to include a related project should include the nature of each environmental resource being examined, the location of the project and its type. Location may be important, for example, when water quality impacts are at issue since projects outside the watershed would probably not contribute to a cumulative effect. Project type may be important, for example, when the impact is specialized, such as a particular air pollutant or mode of traffic.
- (3) Lead agencies should define the geographic scope of the area affected by the cumulative effect and provide a reasonable explanation for the geographic limitation used.
- (4) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and
- (5) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project’s contribution to any significant cumulative effects.”³

“With some projects, the only feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts may involve the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis.”⁴

³ 2012 CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (b)

⁴ 2012 CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (c)

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

“Previously approved land use documents, including, but not limited to, general plans, specific plans, regional transportation plans, plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and local coastal plans may be used in cumulative impact analysis. A pertinent discussion of cumulative impacts contained in one or more previously certified EIRs may be incorporated by reference pursuant to the provisions for tiering and program EIRs. No further cumulative impacts analysis is required when a project is consistent with a general, specific, master or comparable programmatic plan where the lead agency determines that the regional or areawide cumulative impacts of the proposed project have already been adequately addressed, as defined in section 15152(f), in a certified EIR for that plan.”⁵

“If a cumulative impact was adequately addressed in a prior EIR for a community plan, zoning action, or general plan, and the project is consistent with that plan or action, then an EIR for such a project should not further analyze that cumulative impact, as provided in Section 15183(j).”⁶

PAST, PRESENT, PROBABLE FUTURE PROJECTS

TCAG Blueprint Scenario

Under the Tulare County Regional Blueprint Preferred Growth Scenario, TCAG suggested a 25% increase over the status quo scenario, to overall density by 2050. The preferred growth scenario principles included directing growth towards incorporated cities and communities where urban development exists and where comprehensive services and infrastructure are / or will be provided. Another relevant preferred scenario is the creation of urban separators around cities. The project location is outside incorporated areas and would be consistent with the goal of separating urban boundaries.⁷

Tulare County General Plan Update 2030

The Cumulative Analysis outlined in the Tulare County General Plan Update 2030 Recirculated Draft EIR notes regional population growth (which impact was developed by the Tulare County Association of Governments) and a number major projects. Regional population projections are provided in the table below.⁸

**Table 4-1
Regional Population Projections and Planning Efforts**

	General Plan Planning Timeframe	General Plan Buildout Population	Significant Environmental Impacts
City of Dinuba	2006-2026	33,750	Farmland conversion; conflicts with agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts; conversion of agricultural soils to non-agricultural use; regional air quality impacts; and

⁵ 2012 CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130 (d)

⁶ Ibid., Section 15130 (e)

⁷ TGAG Blueprint 2050, Preferred Scenario (2009)

⁸ Tulare County General Plan 2030 Update Recirculated Draft EIR, page 5-4 to 5-5

Draft Environmental Impact Report Harvest Power Project

			climate change-greenhouse gases.
City of Woodlake			Unavailable.
City of Visalia	1991-2020	165,000	Air quality; biological resources; land use conflicts; noise; transportation/traffic; mass transit; agricultural resources; water supply; and visual resources.
City of Tulare	2007-2030	134,910	Farmland conversion; aesthetics; water supply; traffic; air quality; global climate change; noise; flooding from levee or dam failure; biological resources; and cultural resources.
City of Farmersville	2002-2025	12,160	Agricultural resources; agricultural land use conflicts; air quality; and traffic circulation.
City of Exeter			Information unavailable at time of analysis.
City of Lindsay	1990-2010	17,500	Air quality and farmland land conversion.
City of Porterville	2006-2030	107,300	Farmland conversion; air quality; noise; and biological resources.
City of Kingsburg	1992-2012	16,740	Farmland conversion and air quality.
City of Delano	2005-2020	62,850	Air quality; noise; farmland conversion; disruption of agricultural production; and conversion of agricultural soils to non-agricultural use.
County of Fresno	2000-2020	1,113,790	Farmland conversion; reduction in agricultural production; cancellation of Williamson Act Contracts; traffic; transit; bicycle facilities; wastewater treatment facilities; storm drainage facilities; flooding; police protection; fire protection; emergency response services; park and recreation facilities; library services; public services; unidentified cultural resources; water supply; groundwater; water quality; biological resources; mineral resources; air quality; hazardous materials; noise; and visual quality.
County of Kern	2004-2020	1,142,000	Air quality; biological resources; noise; farmland conversion; and traffic.
County of Kings*	1993-2005	149,100 (low) 228,000 (high)	Biological resources; wildlife movement; and special status species.

* The adopted Kings County General Plan did not identify a projected population for 2005. The General Plan does include population projections for 2010, which is included in this table.

SOURCE: City of Delano, 1999; City of Dinuba, 2008; City of Farmersville, 2003; City of Kingsburg, 1992; City of Lindsay, 1989; City of Porterville, 2007; City of Visalia, 2001, 1991; County of Fresno, 2000; County of Kern, 2004; County of Kings, 2009; DOF, 2007; TCAG, 2008.

In addition to the Regional Growth Projections used for the cumulative impact analysis, the Tulare County General Plan Update 2030 Recirculated Draft EIR noted the following Major Projects

- **Goshen:** Status – GPI allowed to proceed. On March 29, 2006, the Tulare County Resource Management Agency convened a meeting with 30 property owners, land developers, services providers, and their representatives, having a development interest in Goshen. The purpose of the meeting was to “...discuss the potential for joint cooperation amongst the various developers and property owners to achieve a well planned community and to foster the spirit of cooperation” towards completion of the Community Plan update

and EIR. The proposed planning study area boundary would add approximately 3,277 acres to the existing Goshen UDB, as opposed to the Draft Goshen Community Plan UDB which adds 422 acres using a needs-based analysis patterned on historical growth trends extrapolated 20 years into the future. The revised boundary incorporates the GPI applicants' lands, the hamlet of West Goshen, and additional land to be held in reserve for future growth. The applicant's land excluding Mangano's "Westfield" totals 661 acres. The area is bounded in the north by Avenues 320 and 312, taking in West Goshen; in the west by Roads 52 and 56; in the south by State Hwy. 198; and in the east by Camp Road and Road 76 at the City of Visalia Sphere of Influence. This 'study' area will be the focus of technical analysis that will set a proposed Urban Development Boundary in which build-out will be contemplated for preparation of the new Goshen Community Plan, EIR and Infrastructure Master Plan. Since the study area involves lands not owned or controlled by the developers, the MOU agreement to be negotiated will contain a provision to reimburse the developers for expenses incurred when development authorized by the new plan occurs.

- **Yokohl Ranch:** Status – GPI allowed to proceed in February 2007. On September 13, 2005, the Tulare County Resource Management Agency received a request from the J.G. Boswell Company and the Eastlake Company, to initiate the formal process to amend the Tulare County General Plan, including the Foothill Growth Management Plan (FGMP), to change the land use designation for the 36,000 acre Yokohl Ranch property from 'Extensive Agriculture' to 'Planned Community Area'. According to the applicants, the proposed amendment will result in master planned communities that balance the needs for housing, neighborhood commercial uses, recreation, ranching operations and open space. As such, 40% (14,400 acres) of the ranch is proposed for development with 60% (21,600 acres) of the property to remain as untouched open space and ranchlands. The developed portions of the ranch will include the Village of Yokohl Ranch, an active adult community accessible to Yokohl Drive; and a Ranch Resort Lodge Enclave located in the northern reaches of the site, approximately four miles south of Lake Kaweah.
- **Rancho Sierra:** Status – GPA approved. The project site consists of 114.6 acres. The site was a golf course facility located on both sides of Liberty Avenue (Avenue 264), east of Road 124, south of the city of Visalia. There are 30 existing homes within the golf course area but not a part of this application. The intended use is to subdivide the site into 175 single family residential lots. The project has been approved.
- **Earlimart:** Status – GPI allowed to proceed January 2006. On September 9, 2005, the Tulare County Resource Management Agency received a request from the Earlimart Development Group, a land development partnership comprised of four business owners with interests in 1,491 acres of private property located both within and outside of the existing Earlimart Urban Development Boundary. The Group is seeking authorization to file an amendment to the Tulare County General Plan, specifically the Earlimart Community Plan (1988). In addition to an updated Community Plan, an Infrastructure Master Plan and Program EIR for the update will also be prepared. The applicants proposed that a 7,680 acre planning study area be established. The area is bounded in the

north by Avenue 68 (Deer Creek as a natural boundary), in the south by Avenue 36 (White River as a natural boundary), in the east by Road 144, and in the west by Road 120. This 'study' area will be the focus of technical analysis that will set the proposed Community Plan boundary for which the new Community Plan, EIR and Infrastructure Master Plan will be prepared. Since the study area involves lands not owned or controlled by the Development Group, the MOU agreement to be negotiated will contain a provision to reimburse the Development Group for expenses when development authorized by the new plan occurs. The Earlimart Development Group has indicated that they have contracts with the consulting firms of Hogle-Ireland, Inc., Provost & Pritchard Engineering Group, Inc. and TPG Consulting or other environmental consulting firm, to prepare the General Plan amendment. However, it is important that preparation of the EIR be managed by the County as Lead Agency for the project.

In addition to the Major Projects outlined in the Tulare County General Plan Update 2030 Recirculated Draft EIR, there are a number of other projects that may produce cumulative impacts. These projects are briefly described below.

- **Pena** – proposed project is for Peña's Material Recovery Facility (MRF) and Transfer Station (TS)' which currently sits on 18.01 acres that are being rezoned from AE 30 to M1 Light Industrial Zoning, and rezoning 6.7 acres and 11.3 acres from residential and industrial reserve zoning to industrial zoning. The land is currently operated by Peña's Disposal, Inc. and has a previously permitted peak processing capacity of 500 tons per day (TPD). This existing facility serves the unincorporated northern portions of Tulare County and the unincorporated southern portions of Fresno County, and the City of Orange Cove in Fresno County. Within the County of Tulare, the facility serves the cities of Dinuba and Porterville, the communities of Cutler, Orosi, London, Sultana, Traver, Seville and other smaller communities in the area that may need to utilize the facility for the recycling of source-separated recyclables, commingled recyclables, commercial and industrial rubbish, green material and wood wastes, construction and demolition wastes, and inert debris to assist in reaching the diversion goals of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939).
- **Pixley Biogas** - The proposed project is for development of a biogas facility on 2.75 acre portion of an 8 acre parcel. The digester will extract methane gas, via an anaerobic manure digester. The facility will be used to produce 266 MMBTUS per day of biogas via an anaerobic digestion of manure feedstock from nearby dairies. The biogas produced will be used to fuel the Calgren bio-refinery facility, located adjacent and to the south of the project site, which will reduce the Calgren plant consumption of natural gas.
- **South County Correctional Detention Facility in Porterville** - The proposed Project will require a rezoning of the project site, which is half in the County and half in the City of Porterville. The proposed project contains a build-out "footprint" for the proposed facility of approximately 15.0 acres with a new maximum security Type II facility as the primary structure. The proposed Project will consist of 250-cell double occupancy units

(500 beds) and 14 special use beds for a total of 514 beds. In addition to the main detention facility, the proposed Project will also include support service components.

As the site is currently under agricultural production, the proposed Project will require new utilities infrastructure (such as electrical, gas, phone, etc.). It will also require streets/roads improvements, potable water systems, wastewater systems, and storm water drainage infrastructure. These will be constructed or expanded to meet facility demands. Where feasible, the Project will be extended to connect with existing potable water, wastewater, and storm water drainage infrastructure provided by City of Porterville. However, possible new construction of the above mentioned infrastructure may be necessary, and as such, will be evaluated.

SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

In this summary section, mitigated impacts and immitigable impacts will be discussed. Checklist item criteria that would result in no impacts or less than significant impacts are discussed in the previous chapter and are not reiterated.

Unavoidable Impacts

There is only one significant and unavoidable impact and is under the mandatory finding of significance for substantial adverse effects by odors impacts on human beings indirectly though accumulation with other adjacent dairy odors.

Table 4-2
Checklist Items with Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Impact Section	Checklist Item #	Checklist Criteria
Mandatory	3.18	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Although, the odor in the cumulative may be significant, the Project provides other environmental benefits. The increased diversion of recyclable food, green, and manure solid waste to landfills, and the use of recycled material for compost and energy purposes is a goal of the State under the Integrated Waste Management Act (AB939), and the purpose of AB 939 is to “reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible.”

Under General Plan Goal: PFS-5.3 Solid Waste Reduction - The County shall promote the maximum feasible use of solid waste reduction, recycling, and composting of wastes, strive to reduce commercial and industrial waste on an annual basis, and pursue financing mechanisms for solid waste reduction programs.

In addition under PFS-5.9 Agricultural Waste - The County shall investigate waste disposal and reuse needs for agricultural wastes for energy and other beneficial uses and shall change County plans accordingly.

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation

Table 4-3
Checklist Items with Less than Significant with Mitigation

Impact Section	Checklist Item #	Checklist Criteria
Aesthetics	3.1 c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
Aesthetics	3.1 d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
Air Quality	3.3 b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
Air Quality	3.3 c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
Cultural Resources	3.5 a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?
Cultural Resources	3.5 b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?
Cultural Resources	3.5 c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
Cultural Resources	3.5 d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
Hydrology	3.9 a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
Utilities	3.17 c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
Utilities	3.17 g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

There are a number of cumulative impacts that can be effectively mitigated. These impacts are listed in the table below.

Please see Chapter 8 for a list of mitigation measures to be implemented as part of the proposed Project.

Less than Significant Impacts

Table 4-4
Checklist Items with Less than Significant Impacts

Impact Section	Checklist Item #	Checklist Criteria
Agricultural & Forestry	3.2 a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the FMMP of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses?
Air Quality	3.3 a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
Air Quality	3.4 d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
Air Quality	3.5 e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?
Biological	3.4 a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat

Draft Environmental Impact Report Harvest Power Project

		modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
Geology	3.6 c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
Greenhouse Gases	3.7 a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
Hazards	3.8 b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
Hydrology	3.9 b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
Noise	3.12 c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
Noise	3.12 d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?
Public Services	3.14 a)	Fire protection?
Recreation	3.15 a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
Traffic	3.16 a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
Traffic	3.16 b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
Utilities	3.17 a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
Utilities	3.17 d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
Land Use	3.10 c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impacts

**Table 4-5
Checklist Items with No Impacts**

Impact Section	Checklist Item #	Checklist Criteria
Aesthetics	3.1 a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
Aesthetics	3.1 b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

Agricultural & Forestry	3.2 b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
Agricultural & Forestry	3.2 c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220(q), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code § 51104(g))?
Agricultural & Forestry	3.2 d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
Agricultural & Forestry	3.2 e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
Biological	3.4 b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?
Biological	3.4 c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
Biological	3.4 d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
Biological	3.4 e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?
Biological	3.4 f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?
Geology	3.6 a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
Geology	3.6 b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
Geology	3.6 d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
Geology	3.6 e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?
Greenhouse Gases	3.7 b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?
Hazards	3.8 a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
Hazards	3.8 c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
Hazards	3.8 d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

		environment?
Hazards	3.8 e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
Hazards	3.8 f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
Hazards	3.8 g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
Hazards	3.8 h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
Hydrology	3.9 c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?
Hydrology	3.9 d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
Hydrology	3.9 e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?
Hydrology	3.9 f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
Hydrology	3.9 g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
Hydrology	3.9 h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
Hydrology	3.9 i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?
Hydrology	3.9 j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?
Land Use	3.10 a)	Physically divide an established community?
Land Use	3.10 b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
Mineral Resources	3.11 a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
Mineral Resources	3.11 b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
Noise	3.12 a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
Noise	3.12 b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
Noise	3.12 e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the

Draft Environmental Impact Report Harvest Power Project

		project area to excessive noise levels?
Noise	3.12 f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
Population & Housing	3.13 a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
Population & Housing	3.13 b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
Population & Housing	3.13 c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
Public Services	3.14 a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
Public Services	3.14 a)	Police protection?
Public Services	3.14 a)	Schools?
Public Services	3.14 a)	Parks?
Public Services	3.14 a)	Other public facilities?
Recreation	3.15 b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
Traffic	3.16 c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
Traffic	3.16 d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
Traffic	3.16 e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?
Traffic	3.16 f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?
Utilities	3.17 b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
Utilities	3.17 e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
Utilities	3.17 f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

REFERENCES

2012 CEQA Guidelines